



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/823,378

04/12/2004

Adam Cain

863.0019.U1(US)

3369

29683 7590 08/06/2008
HARRINGTON & SMITH, PC
4 RESEARCH DRIVE
SHELTON, CT 06484-6212

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, THU HA T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2153

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/06/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/823,378	Applicant(s) CAIN ET AL.	
	Examiner THU HA T. NGUYEN	Art Unit 2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>02/04/08</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims **1, 3-10, 12-16** are presented for examination.
2. Claims 2 and 11 are cancelled without prejudice.
3. Claims 15-16 are newly added.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed on March 31, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because of the following reasons:

5. Applicant argues that the prior art does not teach or suggest the feature of performing an automated security scan of a second network device by a first network device to determine a capability of the second network device.

6. In response to applicant's argument, the examiner submits that Win does teach the feature of performing an automated security scan of a second network device by a first network device to determine a capability of the second network device as shown in line 8, col. 8, line 23-col. 9, line 40, col. 10, line 64-col. 12.

7. In addition, as the independent claims 9, 14 and 16 recited similar feature of claim 1 as discussed above. Therefore, the rejection to independent claims 1, 9, 14 and 16 are sustained.

8. Applicants still have failed to identify specific claim limitations that would define a patentable distinction over cited prior arts. Therefore, the examiner asserts that cited prior art teaches or suggests the subject matter broadly recited in independent claims 1, 9, 14 and 16. Claims 3-8, 10, 12-13, and 15 are also rejected at least by virtue of their dependency on independent

Art Unit: 2153

claims and by other reasons set forth in this office action below. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-10, 12-16 are respectfully rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over **Win et al.** (hereinafter Win) U.S. Patent No. **6,453,353**, in view of **Wright et al.** (hereinafter Wright) U.S. Pub. No. **2004/0123153**.

11. As to claims 1, 14 and 16, Win teaches a method, comprising: performing an automated security scan of a second network device by a first network device to determine a capability of the second network device (line 8, col. 8, line 23-col. 9, line 40, col. 10, line 64-col. 12); generating an attribute certificate based in part on the attribute (col. 7, line 34-col. 8, line 46, col. 10, line 34-col. 11, line 9); storing the attribute certificate including the attribute (col. 6, line 20-65, col. 10, lines 14-67); and responsive to a verified authentication request, determining, that the attribute certificate is valid and authorizing access to a resource over a network based, in part, on the attribute associated with the attribute certificate (col. 9, line 14-col. 10, line 67, col.11, line 43-col. 12, line 8).

Art Unit: 2153

Win teaches the feature of determining an attribute based on a capability of users (abstract, figure 1, col. 6, lines 58-65, col. 11, line 42-col. 12, line 8). However, Win does not explicitly teach determining an attribute based, in part, on the determined capability.

Wright teaches the feature of determining an attribute based, in part, on the determined capability ([0066-0067], [0078]-[0121]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Wright into Win to include the feature of determining an attribute based, in part, on the determined capability because it would have provided different levels of security protection for different location and/or security features are highly desirable for network device.

12. As to claim 3, Win teaches wherein the attribute is further determined based, in part, on a condition to be satisfied (figure 3, col. 8, lines 5-63).

13. As to claim 4, Win teaches wherein the attribute is further associated with a group of network devices (col. 13, lines 35-67).

14. As to claim 5, Win teaches wherein the attribute is further associated with a group of users (col. 13, lines 35-67).

Art Unit: 2153

15. As to claim 6, Win teaches, wherein the attribute certificate is generated by at least one of the first network device, an access server, and an attribute authority (figure 1).

16. As to claim 7, Win teaches wherein the attribute certificate is stored in at least one of the second network device, and an attribute repository (figure 1).

17. As to claim 8, Win teaches wherein the attribute certificate is provided to an access server through the use of at least one of a cookie, a program, and a manual upload (col. 10, line 41-col. 12, lines 8).

18. As to claim 9, Win teaches an apparatus, comprising: an interface configured to perform an automated security scan of a network device to determine a capability of the network device (col. 10, line 64-col. 12, line 8, col. 8, line 23-col. 9, line 40, col. 10, line 34-67); a memory configured to store the attribute certificate including the attribute (col. 7, line 34-col. 8, line 46, col. 10, line 34-col. 11, line 9); responsive to a verified authentication request, the processor further configured to determine that the attribute certificate is valid and to authorize access to a resource over a network based, in part, on the attribute associated with the attribute certificate (col. 9, line 14-col. 10, line 67, col. 11, line 43-col. 12, line 8).

Art Unit: 2153

Win teaches the processor configured to generate an attribute certificate, wherein the attribute certificate is based, in part, on a capability of users (abstract, figure 1, col. 6, lines 58-65, col. 11, line 42-col. 12, line 8). However, Win does not explicitly teach a processor configured to determine an attribute based, in part on the determined capability; the processor further configured to generate an attribute certificate based, in part, on the attribute.

Wright teaches the processor further configured to generate an attribute certificate based, in part, on the attribute ([0066-0067], [0078]-[0121]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Wright into Win to include the feature of determining an attribute based on the determined capability of a network device because it would have provided different levels of security protection for different location and/or security features are highly desirable for network device.

19. As to claim 10, Win teaches wherein the processor is further configured to generate the attribute certificate based on a condition to be satisfied (figure 3, col. 8, lines 5-63).

20. As to claim 12, Win teaches wherein the processor is further configured to generate the attribute certificate based on the automated security scan of the other network device (abstract, col. 5, line 55-col. 6, line 10, col. 10, lines 34-67).

Art Unit: 2153

21. As to claim 13, Win teaches wherein the interface is further configured to send the attribute certificate to the network device to be stored (figure 1).

22. As to claim 15, **Win** teaches wherein the means to perform an automated scan comprises an interface; and the means for determining, generating, storing, and means responsive comprises a central processing unit coupled to the interface and further coupled to a memory (col. 7, line 34-col. 8, line 46, col. 10, line 34-col. 11, line 9).

Conclusion

23. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu Ha Nguyen, whose telephone number is (571) 272-3989. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess, can be reached at (571) 272-3949.

Art Unit: 2153

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571) 273-8300 for regular communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/THUHA T. NGUYEN/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2153

Art Unit: 2153